

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: CV 23-02360 JAK (RAOx) Date: February 11, 2025
Title: Suzette Kelly v. Fashion Nova, LLC

Present: The Honorable **ROZELLA A. OLIVER, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Eddie Ramirez
Deputy Clerk

Tape No.: N/A
Court Reporter/Recorder: N/A

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff(s):
N/A

Attorneys Present for Defendant(s):
N/A

Proceedings: (In Chambers) **MINUTE ORDER RE: APPLICATION TO SEAL
[267] AND REQUEST FOR IN CAMERA REVIEW [270]**

The Court held a hearing on Defendant’s pending motion for contempt on January 27, 2025. Dkt. No. 219. The Court permitted Plaintiffs to provide a supplemental filing regarding ability to pay by February 10, 2025. *Id.* The Court permitted Plaintiffs to file private financial documents under seal. *Id.* However, to the extent Plaintiffs wanted to submit documents *in camera*, they were directed to file a separate request under L.R. 79-6 with citation to relevant caselaw. *Id.*

On February 10, 2025, Plaintiffs filed a number of documents. Plaintiffs filed an Application to file Exhibit A to their supplemental filing under seal. Dkt. Nos. 267, 268. Plaintiffs also filed their supplemental filing with the redacted version of Exhibit A attached. Dkt. No. 269. Plaintiffs filed a document that has docket text suggesting it is a request for *in camera* review, but the document is a declaration of Ms. Kelly. Dkt. No. 270. Plaintiffs also filed that same declaration under seal, with its accompanying exhibits. Dkt. No. 271.

The Court has already granted Plaintiffs leave to file financial information under seal. Therefore, the Application to Seal is GRANTED. It is unclear whether the unredacted version of Exhibit A has been served on opposing counsel. To the extent it has not, Plaintiffs’ counsel is ordered to serve the unredacted version of Exhibit A on opposing counsel forthwith. Additionally, it appears that the redacted version of Exhibit A is missing two pages. *See* Dkt. Nos. 268-1, 268-2. Plaintiffs are ordered to re-file the complete version of redacted Exhibit A.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: CV 23-02360 JAK (RAOx) Date: February 11, 2025
Title: Suzette Kelly v. Fashion Nova, LLC

As to the purported request for *in camera* review, it is unclear if Plaintiffs are relying on Ms. Kelly's declaration as the request or if they inadvertently filed the declaration as the request instead of some other submission. To the extent Plaintiffs inadvertently filed the declaration instead of a separate request for *in camera* review, Plaintiffs are ordered to file the request for *in camera* review by close of business on **February 11, 2025**.

The Clerk shall email a copy of this order to counsel of record.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer _____ : _____
er